UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,496	02/17/2004	Joel K. Grossman	13768.495	3351

47973 7590 02/07/2008

WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER	
STEVENS, ROBERT	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/780,496	GROSSMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert Stevens	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 November 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-15,18,21 and 28-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-15,18,21 and 28-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *20070824, 20071022*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Office withdraws the previous rejections of the claims under 35 USC §103(a), in light of the amendment. However, the Office sets forth new rejections of the claims under 35 USC §103(a), in light of the amendment.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1, 4-15, 18, 21 and 28-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Dettinger et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0114329, filed Nov. 20, 2003 and published May 26, 2005, hereafter referred to as "Dettinger") in view of Lucovsky et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0131073, provisionally filed Mar. 14, 2001 and published Jul. 10, 2003, hereafter referred to as "Lucovsky").

Regarding independent claim 1: Dettinger teaches ***In a computing system that has access to contact data stored according to a schema in a data store, the data store being in communication with applications configured to request access to schematized contact data in the data store, one or more of the applications lacking the configuration to natively access the schematized contact data,*** (See Dettinger paragraph [0039] discussing translation of queries into a form to access database information organized according to a schema.) ***a method for simplifying access to the schematized contact data, the method comprising: an application receiving a request to access contact data stored in a data store, wherein the data store is centralized and acting as a single data store for contact data for a plurality of applications accessing contact data, and wherein the centralized data store stores all contact data for the plurality of applications according to a single schema for which the application receiving the request lacks the configuration to natively access;*** (See Dettinger paragraph [0039] discussing the transformation of queries into a form consistent with the physical representation of the data.) ***the application calling an external contact data control to request the contact data in a non-schematized format*** (See Dettinger Fig. 2 in context of paragraph [0039] teaching the transformation of queries into a form consistent with the physical representation of the data.) ***the application receiving the requested contact data from the external contact data control in the non-schematized format, the contact data received by the application having been converted from a corresponding schematized format by the external data contact control;*** (See Dettinger paragraph [0046] discussing transforming of a user query into a concrete query based upon a data abstraction model.) ***and the application causing a display device to display the contact data to a user of the application, the displayed contact data corresponding to the contact data***

received by the application in a non-schematized format and converted by the external contact data control from the schematized format, and the contact data being displayed notwithstanding that the application lacks the configuration to natively access the contact data stored in the data store according to the schema. (See Dettinger paragraph [0042] discussing display to a requesting user in the user's natural language, in the context of paragraph [0039] discussing the organization of a database in accordance with an XM schema.)

However, Dettinger does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Lucovsky, though, discloses ***wherein the application calling the external contact data control includes the application requesting that the external contact data control retrieve the contact data and translate the contact data from a schematized format to the non-schematized format, and further requesting that the external contact data provide the application with authorization to access the schematized contact data, wherein the application natively lacks both the configuration and authorization to access the schematized contact data;*** (See Lucovsky paragraph [0644] discussing the LiveContacts mechanism for "subscribed-to" contacts and paragraph [0068] discussing Role access and the limiting of the scope of the provided contact information.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lucovsky for the benefit of Dettinger, because to do so allowed a system designer to implement a mechanism for application programs or devices to access contact data regardless of the device type or application program in use, as taught by Lucovsky in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., management of contact information.

Regarding claim 4: Dettinger does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Lucovsky, though, discloses ***wherein the act of the application calling an external contact data control comprises an act of calling a contact data control that prevents empty data fields from being presented.*** (See Lucovsky paragraphs [0655] and [0669], for example, teaching the use of schema variables to indicate the occurrence of optional data and layout, it having been implied that if data does not exist that it wouldn't be provided/displayed, but the requested existing data would be provided/displayed.)

Regarding claim 5: Dettinger does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Lucovsky, though, discloses ***wherein the act of the application calling an external contact data control comprises an act of calling a contact data control that offers an actionable user-interface.*** (See Lucovsky paragraph [0056] discussing presentation of an action menu representing "things to do with addresses".)

Regarding claim 6: Dettinger does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Lucovsky, though, discloses ***selecting a portion of displayed contact data from the actionable user-interface to cause an action associated with an updated application to be performed.*** (See Lucovsky paragraph [0056] discussing presentation of an action menu representing "things to do with addresses".)

Regarding claim 7: Dettinger does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Lucovsky, though, discloses ***wherein the act of the application calling an external contact data control comprises an act of calling an external contact data control that presents tasks associated with a data field when focus is shifted to the data field.*** (See Lucovsky paragraph [0056] discussing presentation of an action menu representing "things to do with addresses", it being noted that mouseover events were well known in the art.)

Regarding claim 8: Dettinger does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Lucovsky, though, discloses ***wherein the act of the application calling an external contact data control comprises an act of calling an external contact data control that provides a pop-up menu to manipulate contact data.*** (See Lucovsky paragraph [0056] discussing presentation of an action menu representing "things to do with addresses".)

Regarding claim 9: Dettinger does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Lucovsky, though, discloses ***wherein the act of the application calling an external contact data control comprises an act of calling an external contact data control that determines the size of an interface based on the user-input.*** (See Lucovsky paragraph [0069] discussing the specification of a layout.)

Regarding claim 10: Dettinger does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Lucovsky, though, discloses ***wherein the act of the application calling an external contact data control comprises an act of calling an external contact data control that***

appropriately presents contact data based on a location associated with the contact data. (See Lucovsky paragraph [0691] discussing the use of latitude and longitude location information.)

Regarding claim 11: Dettinger teaches ***wherein the act of the application calling an external contact data control comprises an act of calling an external contact data control that determines the contact data to be displayed based on user-input.*** (See Dettinger paragraph [0042] discussing user queries and the displaying of results to a user.)

Regarding claim 12: Dettinger does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Lucovsky, though, discloses ***wherein the act of calling a contact data control that determines the contact data to be displayed based on user-input comprises an act of determining the contact data to be displayed based on a presentation template.*** (See Lucovsky paragraphs [0643] – [0644} discussing a "LiveContacts" mechanism and updating of presented contact information.)

Regarding claim 13: Dettinger does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Lucovsky, though, discloses ***wherein the act of calling a contact data control that determines the contact data to be displayed based on user-input comprises an act of determining the contact data to be displayed based on a dynamically updated presentation template.*** (See Lucovsky paragraphs [0643] – [0644} discussing a "LiveContacts" mechanism and updating of presented contact information.)

Regarding claim 14: Dettinger teaches ***wherein the act of the application calling an external contact data control that determines the contact data to be displayed based on user-input comprises an act calling an external contact data control that sets a default value for a multi-value set.*** (See Dettinger paragraph [0050] discussing the use of filters to define/present a particular subset of items.)

Regarding claim 31: Dettinger does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Lucovsky, though, discloses ***receiving user selection of a limited portion of the displayed contact data, and the application automatically initiating communication with the contact by the mere selection of the limited portion of the contact data.*** (See Lucovsky paragraph [0643] discussing the automatic use of selected contact data.)

Regarding claim 36: Dettinger does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Lucovsky, though, discloses ***wherein the single data store stores contact information for a plurality of contacts, and wherein each contact has a single set of contact data merged from a plurality of applications and stored in the schematized format.*** (See Lucovsky paragraphs [0642] – [0643] discussing the use of a profile for controlling categorization and visibility of contacts.)

Regarding independent claim 15: Dettinger teaches ***In a computing system that has access to contact data that is stored in a centralized data store according to a single schematized format for multiple applications, in the data store being in communication with applications configured to request access to schematized contact data, one or more of the applications lacking the configuration to natively access schematized contact data in the data store,*** (See Dettinger paragraph [0039] discussing translation of queries into a form to access database information organized according to a schema.) ***a method for simplifying access to the schematized contact data, the method comprising: receiving contact data for one or more contacts, the contact data being received by an application that lacks the configuration to natively access contact data of a schematized format,*** (See Dettinger paragraph [0041] discussing the receiving of data in a first natural language expression.) ***the application causing a display device to display to a user of the application at least a portion of the contact data for the one or more contacts;*** (See Dettinger paragraph [0042] discussing display of contact data to a user.) ***the centralized data store acting as a single data store for contact data for the application and one or more other applications that access the contact data, the centralized data store storing the contact information in the schematized format, and the updated contact data in the data store being stored in the schematized format such that the one or more other applications can access the updated contact data in the schematized format;*** (See Dettinger Fig. 2 in context of paragraph [0039] teaching the transformation of queries into a form consistent with the physical representation of the data.) ***and using the application or the one or more other applications, accessing the updated contact data from the centralized data store and displaying the updated contact data to a user of the respective application.*** (See Dettinger

Fig. 1 in the context of paragraphs [0042] and [0039] teaching display to a requesting user in the user's natural language and the organization of a database in accordance with an XM schema.)

However, Dettinger does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Lucovsky, though, discloses ***receiving, at the application, updates to the contact data for the one or more contacts;*** (See Lucovsky paragraph [0728] discussing methods for updating contact information.) ***the application calling the external contact data control, wherein calling the external contact data control includes the application sending the updates to the contact data to the external contact data control in a non-schematized format and requesting that the external contact data control translate the contact data from the non-schematized format to a schematized format and update the contact data for the one or more contacts in a centralized data store to reflect the updates to the contact data,*** (See Lucovsky Abstract discussing a schema-based contacts service, in context of paragraph [0728] discussing methods for updating contact information.) ***and wherein the application calling the external contact data control further includes the application requesting that the external contact data control provide the application with access to update the contact data in the schematized format, wherein the application natively lacks both the configuration and authorization to access the schematized contact data;*** (See Lucovsky paragraph [0644] discussing the LiveContacts mechanism for "subscribed-to" contacts and paragraph [0068] discussing Role access and the limiting of the scope of the provided contact information.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lucovsky for the benefit of Dettinger, because to do so allowed a system designer to implement a mechanism for application programs or devices to access contact

data regardless of the device type or application program in use, as taught by Lucovsky in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., management of contact information.

Regarding claim 18: Dettinger teaches ***wherein the act of calling the application an external contact data control comprises an act of calling an external contact data control that checks the validity of the contact data received by the application in a non-schematized format.*** (See Dettinger paragraph [0059] discussing the consistency of stored data with queries for accessing such data.)

Regarding claim 32: Dettinger teaches ***the external contact data control determining that the accessed contact data includes international contact information relative to the user;*** (See Dettinger paragraph [0055] discussing translation of query elements into Russian, for example.)

However, Dettinger does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Lucovsky, though, discloses ***and the external contact data control determining how the international contact data is to be formatted for an international location and re-ordering the contact data according to a suitable format for the international location.*** (See Lucovsky paragraph [0669] discussing the use of layout information based on language or country codes as described in RFC 1766.)

Regarding claim 33: Dettinger does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Lucovsky, though, discloses ***wherein the external contact data control accesses an external repository to determine a standard formatting for the international location.*** (See Lucovsky paragraph [0669] discussing the use of layout information based on language or country codes as described in RFC 1766, it having been an obvious variant as to whether data and/or applications are hosted locally or remotely.)

Regarding claim 34: Dettinger does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Lucovsky, though, discloses ***wherein the external contact data control accesses a presentation template for displaying contact data according to the suitable formatting for the international location.*** (See Lucovsky paragraph [0669] discussing the use of layout information based on language or country codes as described in RFC 1766.)

Regarding claim 35: Dettinger does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Lucovsky, though, discloses ***wherein the presentation template is defined by the user's presentation preferences.*** (See Lucovsky paragraphs [0642] – [0643] discussing the use of a profile for controlling categorization and visibility of contacts.)

Regarding independent claim 21: Dettinger teaches ***A computing system, comprising: at least one external contact data control that can be executed by the one or more processors,*** (See Dettinger Fig. 1 and 2 in the context of paragraphs [0045]-[0046] teaching execution of contact data management software.) ***the at least one external contact data control being configured to: receive a request from an application that lacks the configuration to natively access the contact data stored at the centralized data store in the schematized format, the request including a request to retrieve the contact data, to translate the contact data from the schematized format to the non-schematized format,*** (See Dettinger Fig. 2 in context of paragraph [0039] teaching the transformation of queries into a form to access database information organized according to a schema.) ***retrieve contact data from the centralized data store and in the schematized format in response to the request;*** (See Dettinger paragraph [0046] in context of paragraphs [0059]-[0060] teaching the retrieval of data using a data abstraction model to physically locate the stored data.) ***convert retrieved contact data from the schematized format to a corresponding non-schematized format such that the application can present contact data to a user notwithstanding that the application lacks the configuration to access contact data directly in the schematized format;*** (See Dettinger paragraph [0046] discussing transforming of a user query into a concrete query based upon a data abstraction model.) ***and send the contact data in the non-schematized format to the application to be presented to a user.*** (See Dettinger paragraph [0042] discussing display to a requesting user in the user's natural language, in the context of paragraph [0039] discussing the organization of a database in accordance with an XM schema.)

However, Dettinger does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Lucovsky, though, discloses ***one or more processors;*** (See Lucovsky Fig. 1 #120.) ***and one or more computer-readable storage media,*** (See Lucovsky Fig. 1 #141, 152, 156.) ***having stored thereon: a centralized data store acting as a single data store of contact data for a plurality of applications which access the contact data, wherein the centralized data store stores all contact data for the plurality of applications and according to a single schema not natively understood by one or more of the plurality of applications,*** (See Lucovsky Fig. 4 in context of the Abstract teaching the use of a schema-based service model for users to access contact data regardless of the device or application being used.) ***one or more of the plurality of applications that are not configured to natively access the schematized contact data and which are not authorized to access the schematized contact data, and*** (See Lucovsky Fig. 4 in context of the Abstract teaching the use of a schema-based service model for users to access contact data regardless of the device or application being used.) ***and to provide the application with authorization to access the schematized contact data;*** (See Lucovsky paragraph [0644] discussing the LiveContacts mechanism for "subscribed-to" contacts and paragraph [0068] discussing Role access and the limiting of the scope of the provided contact information.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lucovsky for the benefit of Dettinger, because to do so allowed a system designer to implement a mechanism for application programs or devices to access contact data regardless of the device type or application program in use, as taught by Lucovsky in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., management of contact information.

Regarding independent claim 28: Dettinger teaches ***A computing system, comprising: at least one external contact data control that can be executed by the one or more processors,*** (See Dettinger Fig. 1 and 2 in the context of paragraphs [0045]-[0046] teaching execution of contact data management software.) ***the at least external one contact data control being configured to: receive a request from an application to access contact data for one or more contacts, the contact data being stored in the centralized data store in a schematized format, and the application making the request notwithstanding the application lacking the configuration to natively access contact data in the schematized format, the request further including a request to translate convert the contact data from the schematized format to a non-schematized format,*** (See Dettinger Fig. 2 in context of paragraph [0039] teaching the transformation of queries into a form to access database information organized according to a schema.) ***retrieve contact data from the centralized data store corresponding to the request from the application, the retrieved contact data being in the schematized format;*** (See Dettinger paragraph [0046] in context of paragraphs [0059]-[0060] teaching the retrieval of data using a data abstraction model to physically locate the stored data.) ***convert the limited portions of the contact data in the schematized format to the non-schematized format;*** (See Dettinger paragraph [0046] discussing transforming of a user query into a concrete query based upon a data abstraction model.) ***convert the updated contact data from the non-schematized format to a corresponding schematized format that conforms with the contact data schema of the centralized data source, thereby allowing the application to update contact data in the schematized format notwithstanding that the application lacks the configuration to natively***

access the contact data stored in the schematized format; (See Dettinger paragraph [0046] discussing transforming of a user query into a concrete query based upon a data abstraction model.)

However, Dettinger does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Lucovsky, though, discloses ***one or more processors;*** (See Lucovsky Fig. 1 #120.) ***and one or more computer-readable storage media,*** (See Lucovsky Fig. 1 #141, 152, 156.) ***having stored thereon: a centralized data store acting as a single data store of contact data for a plurality of applications which access the contact data, wherein the centralized data store stores all contact data for the plurality of applications and according to a single schema not natively understood by one or more of the plurality of applications,*** (See Lucovsky Fig. 4 in context of the Abstract teaching the use of a schema-based service model for users to access contact data regardless of the device or application being used.) ***one or more of the plurality of applications lacking the configuration to natively access the schematized contact data and which are not authorized to access the schematized contact data, and*** (See Lucovsky Fig. 4 in context of the Abstract teaching the use of a schema-based service model for users to access contact data regardless of the device or application being used.) ***and a request to provide the application with authorization to access the schematized contact data;*** (See Lucovsky paragraph [0644] discussing the LiveContacts mechanism for "subscribed-to" contacts and paragraph [0068] discussing Role access and the limiting of the scope of the provided contact information.) ***manage access of the application to the retrieved contact data for the one or more contacts, wherein managing access includes granting the application access to only limited portions of contact data for one or more contacts;*** (See Lucovsky Abstract in context of paragraph [0068]

teaching the use of a Role corresponding to access, including given some users access to a home telephone number, and others access to a business telephone number.) ***determine that some fields in the limited portions of the contact data have a null value;*** (See Lucovsky paragraphs [0655] and [0669] discussing the use of optional data.) ***suppress the fields having a null value and provide the remaining fields of the contact data to the application in the non-schematized format;*** (See Lucovsky paragraphs [0655] and [0669], for example, teaching the use of schema variables to indicate the occurrence of optional data and layout, it having been implied that if data does not exist that it wouldn't be provided/displayed, but the requested existing data would be provided/displayed.) ***receive updated contact data in the non-schematized format from the application;*** (See Lucovsky paragraph [0728] discussing an "update" command.) ***and store corresponding contact data in the centralized data store and in the schematized format such that other applications can access the stored contact data in accordance with the contact data schema.*** (See Lucovsky Fig. 4 in the context of paragraph [0728] teaching commands for updating, deleting and replacing, it having been implied that such edits to contact data were to be saved.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lucovsky for the benefit of Dettinger, because to do so allowed a system designer to implement a mechanism for application programs or devices to access contact data regardless of the device type or application program in use, as taught by Lucovsky in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., management of contact information.

Regarding claim 29: Dettinger teaches ***wherein the external contact data control is configured to convert the contact data from the non-schematized format to a corresponding schematized format by calling a parser that parses the contact data of the non-schematized format such that the non-schematized contact data can be made to conform with the contact data schema***. (See Dettinger paragraph [0059] discussing the parsing of the abstract query corresponding to the natural language contact data request and building the concrete query to locate the stored contact data elements.)

Claim 30 is substantially similar to claim 18, and therefore likewise rejected.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Non-Patent Literature

Zhan, H. F., et al., "A Web-Based Collaborative Product Design Platform for Dispersed Network Manufacturing", Journal of Materials Processing, Vol. 138, Issues 1-3, Jul. 20, 2003, pp. 600-604.

Huynh, David, et al., "Haystack: A Platform for Creating, Organizing and Visualizing Information Using RDF", Semantic Web Workshop (at WWW2002), Honolulu, HI, May 2002, pp. 1-11.

Getting Results with Microsoft Office 97, Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA, © 1997, pp. 28-31, 345-374 and 470-471.

Padwick, Gordon, et al., Special Edition Using Microsoft Outlook 2000, Que Corp., Indianapolis, IN, May 1999, pp. 370-376, 382-386 and 392-396.

Morrison, Michael, et al., XML Unleashed, SAMS Corp., Indianapolis, IN, Dec. 1999, pp. 26-37, 84-104 and 106-122.

US Patent Application Publications

Shrinivasan et al	2006/0174002
Dettinger et al	2004/0254939
Lucovsky et al	2003/0050911
Lucovsky et al	2003/0041076
Lucovsky et al	2003/0041065
Davis et al	2002/0029254
Carlson et al	2002/0169841
Shrinivasan et al	2002/0174237
Brown	2002/0156895
Haverstock et al	2001/0005848

US Patents

Shrinivasan et al	7,010,599
Banerjee et al	7,076,498
Tang et al	7,159,207
Pulliam et al	6,609,108
McGill et al	6,678,685
Bates et al	6,247,043
Smith	6,895,388

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Robert Stevens
Examiner
Art Unit 2162

January 29, 2008

SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER